

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Laureen Glaze Washington,

Plaintiff,

v.

Maria Walls; Jennifer Ginn Youmans;
Bertrand Dore; Herbert N. Glaze; Leroy
Ernest Glaze, Jr.

Defendants.

Case 9:24-01102-RMG

ORDER AND OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of the Magistrate Judge, recommending this action be summarily dismissed without issuance and service of process and without leave to amend and recommending Plaintiff’s motion for default judgment be denied. (Dkt. No. 15). Plaintiff filed objections to the R & R. (Dkt. No. 18). For the reasons set forth below, the Court adopts the R & R as the Order of the Court.

I. Background

Plaintiff appears to allege claims under the False Claims Act against Maria Walls, the Treasurer for Beaufort County; Jennnifer Ginn Youmans, the Treasurer for Hampton County; Bertrand Dore, an attorney, Herbert Glaze, Plaintiff’s paternal uncle; and Leroy Glaze, Plaintiff’s brother. Plaintiff generally alleges that Defendants prevented her from inheriting certain pieces of land in Beaufort and Hampton County from her grandmother and/or father. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants have provided her with false records regarding the properties.

II. Standard

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 96 S.Ct. 549, 46 L.Ed.2d 483 (1976). The Court is charged

with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

III. Discussion

After reviewing the Complaint, the R & R, and Plaintiff's objections, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge ably and correctly addressed the issues in this case and agrees with the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that this action be dismissed and that Plaintiff's motion for default judgment be denied.

The Court agrees that the Court lacks jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims to the extent Plaintiff is attempting to appeal the result of a state court ruling regarding the properties in question. The Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that this Court cannot sit in judgment of a state court decision and must dismiss any claims concerning any state court decisions for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff objects arguing that diversity of citizenship jurisdiction exists because Plaintiff resides in Florida and Defendants reside in South Carolina. This fact does not give this Court the authority to review a state court decision. Accordingly, the Court overrules Plaintiff's objection and dismisses Plaintiff's claims to the extent they attempt to appeal the result of a state court decision.

The Court agrees that Plaintiff may not bring a claim under the False Claims Act without an attorney because a person proceeding pro se cannot appear pro se on behalf of other persons or entities, including the United States. The Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that, to the extent Plaintiff is attempting to be the relator in a qui tam action, she may not represent the United States without assistance of counsel. Plaintiff, in her objections, states that she has attempted consulting an attorney and is contacting pro bono attorneys to represent her and the United States.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's objection is unavailing, and the Court finds that Plaintiff cannot proceed on her False Claims Act claims.

The Court also agrees that Plaintiff has failed to state any state law claims regardless of her assertion of diversity jurisdiction.

Lastly, the Court agrees that Plaintiff's Motion and Amended Motion for Default Judgment be denied because this action was under initial review by the Court and there is no indication that Defendants have been served with the Complaint or Amended Complaint in this action. Plaintiff objects arguing that she did serve Defendants with the Complaint and the motion for default judgment. The Court overrules Plaintiff's objection because service has not been authorized in this action. Accordingly, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motion and Amended Motion for Default Judgment.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the Court **ADOPTS** the R & R (Dkt. No. 15) as the Order of the Court and **DISMISSES** this action without issuance and service of process and without leave to amend. The Court also **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion and Amended Motion for Default Judgment (Dkt. Nos. 6 and 8).

s/ Richard Mark Gergel
Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge

August 1, 2024
Charleston, South Carolina